also permitted to provide IPTV services after obtaining specific approval. Cable TV operators registered under Cable Television Networks (Regulation) Act, 1995 can also provide IPTV services without requiring any further license or registration.

IPTV services have become possible due to advancements in technology and availability of faster bandwidth speeds. The services is capable of providing content from diverse sources which may include broadcast channels, internet based content or content hosted on servers apart from the above. The Government is in the process of formulation of policy guidelines as to how such content from diverse sources is going to be regulated especially when it is provided by the Access Service Licensees of Department of Telecom. A Joint Group of the Department of Telecom and Ministry of Information & Broadcasting was set up to examine the related issues and the Joint Group has submitted its recommendations to the Government which are under examination. Telecom Regulatory Authority of India (TRAI) has also floated a consultation paper on provisioning of IPTV services and the issues relating thereto. The recommendations of TRAI are also awaited on the issue.

(e) Objectionable/obscene contents are prohibited under rules made under Indian Telegraph Act 1885 and license granted under Indian Telegraph Act. Further transmission of such contents can be prohibited under the said Act. Such content also attracts the provisions of Information Technology Act, 2000, as modified from time to time. As far as the cable operators are concerned such content is prohibited under the Programme Code and Advertisement Code prescribed under the Cable TV Networks (Regulation) Act, 1995 and the rules made thereunder.

Implementation of ARWSP

*93. SHRI RAJKUMAR DHOOT: Will the Minister of RURAL DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state:

(a) whether Accelerated Rural Water Supply Programme (ARWSP) introduced in 1972-73 assists States and Union Territories with 100 per cent grant-in-aid to implement drinking water supply to problem villages;

(b) if so, the amount of grant-in-aid provided to different States and Union Territories till March, 2007 and number of villages covered in each of them;

(c) the provision made for the purpose during 2007-08 and by when all problem villages are likely to be provided with drinking water; and

(d) the authorities made responsible to ensure that the grant-in-aid provided are utilized for the purpose and all such villages are no more starved of drinking water?

THE MINISTER OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT (DR. RAGHUVANSH PRASAD SINGH): (a) To accelerate the pace of coverage of problem villages, the Government of India introduced the Accelerated Rural Water Supply Programme (ARWSP) in the year 1972-73 to assist States and UTs with 100% grants-in-aid to implement drinking water suply schemes in such villages. This programme continued till 1973-74, but with the introduction of the Minimum Needs Programme (MNP) during the Fifth Five Year Plan (from 1974-75), ARWSP was withdrawn. The programme was, however, reintroduced in 1977-78 with fund sharing between the Central and State Governments, respectively on 50:50 basis, when the progress of supply of safe drinking water to identified problem villages under the MNP was not adequately focused. Presently, ARWSP (Normal) for coverage including sustainability and operation & maintenance, is funded on 50:50 basis, whereas Sub-Mission on water quality is on 75:25 basis between the Centre and the States, respectively. The funding for coverage in DDP areas, relief from natural calamities and support activities is on 100% basis.

(b) and (c) Till March, 2007, an amount of Rs. 32,954.26 crore has been provided by the Government of India in the drinking water sector. The coverage status of habitations is dynamic

and varies from season to season and year to year. During 2007-08, Rs. 6,500 crore has been allocated under ARWSP out of which, Rs. 3,177 crore has been released. Drinking water supply is a component of Bharat Nirman, a time-bound plan for building rural infrastructure to be implemented from 2005-06 to 2008-09, under which all un-covered and slipped back habitations are to be covered and quality affected habitations are to be adressed for water quality problems. During 2005-06, against the target of covering 56,270 habitations, 97,215 habitations have been covered and in 2006-07, against the target of 73,120 habitations 1,07,350 habitations have been reported to be covered. The achivement during 2005-06 and 2006-07 is 173% and 147%, respectively. During 2007-08, against the target of 1,55,499 habitations, so far 71,234 un-covered/slipped-back and quality-affected habitations are reported to be covered/addressed for water quality problems. The latest status of State-wise achivement under Bharat Nirman is enclosed as Statement (*See* below)

(d) Rural water supply is a State subject and as such, State Governments are primarily responsible to ensure that the grants-in-aid provided under ARWSP are utilized and safe drinking water is available in rural habitations. State Governments decide the implementing agencies for the programme, which varies from State to State. In some of the States, Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs) are responsible for the implementation as well as operation & maintenance of water supply schemes.

Statement

State-wise achievement made under Bharat Nirman

Sl.No.	State/UT	2005-06		2006-07		2007-08	
		Target	Achieve-ment	Target	Achieve-ment	Target	Achieve-ment*
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1.	Andhra Pradesh	2,974	3,294	3,957	5,198	9,910	4,539
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	397	325	328	245	1,584	~~610~~
3.	Assam	1,871	2,428	2,978	2,491	12,680	6,034
4.	Bihar	1,623	1,625	5,116	15,430	20,963	5,966
5.	Chhattisgarh	4,000	10,329	4,800	8,230	3,714	3,134
6.	Goa	1	1	6	1	0	1
7.	Gujarat	1,059	1,034	2,329	2,361	3,139	2,232
8.	Haryana	791	415	725	768	823	352
9.	Himachal Pradesh	1,336	1,950	3,000	3,694	5,044	2,298
10.	Jammu & Kashmir	479	463	1,008	549	2,058	220
11.	Jharkhand	2,888	2,100	3,802	1,982	5,479	696
12.	Karnataka	4,790	3,883	5,333	2,686	6,372	4,050
13.	Kerala	831	2,149	1,065	1,505	2,545	827
14.	Madhya Pradesh	3,352	10,390	6,963	13,344	10,107	8,936
15.	Maharashtra	1,894	2,806	7,673	6,152	14,886	1,166
16.	Manipur	133	80	123	178	3	37
17.	Meghalaya	348	472	700	1,118	1,421	271
18.	Mizoram	130	130	134	134	89	30
19.	Nagaland	64	125	274	123	381	153

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
20.	Orissa	2,176	11,509	4,226	8,425	5,577	7,630
21.	Punjab	800	1,701	882	875	2,435	425
22.	Rajasthan	9,952	13,346	2,853	7,990	22,024	9,594
23.	Sikkim	71	120	164	138	254	209
24.	Tamil Nadu	7,500	8,338	3,072	7,156	12,538	5,006
25.	Tripura	425	204	446	570	589	1,410
26.	Uttar Pradesh	2,209	14,366	7,024	10,947	3,587	1,740
27.	Uttarakhand	450	484	111	1,896	2,494	3,141
28.	West Bengal	3,669	2,945	3,900	3,039	4,761	513
29.	A & N Islands	14	63	45	31	6	0
30.	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	18	36	16	9	8	13
31.	Daman & Diu	0		0	0	0	0
32.	Delhi	0		0	0	0	0
33.	Lakshadweep	10	0	3	0	7	0
34.	Puducherry	15	104	64	85	21	1
35.	Chandigarh	0		0	0	0	0
	TOTAL	56,270	97,215	73,120	107,350	155,499	71,234

*Number of habitations covered/addressed as on October 31, 2007

Violation of TV norms by broadcasters

*94. SHRI DHARAM PAL SABHARWAL: Will the Minister of INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that several TV broadcasters like Sony TV are telecasting advertisements in non-empanelled serials/programmes of Directorate of Advertising and Visual Publicity (DAVP);

(b) if so, the details thereof and the reasons therefor;

(c) whether these broadcasters are violating guidelines and norms of DAVP by telecasting advertisements on non-empanelled serials/programmes of DAVP; and

(d) if so, the action taken against these broadcasters and whether DAVP would recover advertisement cost from these channels and if not the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING (SHRI PRIYARANJAN DASMUNSI): (a) No, Sir. DAVP empanels only TV Channels and not serials or programmes.

(b) to (d) Does not arise.

Unregulated growth of BPOs

*95. SHRI T.T.V. DHINAKARAN: Will the Minister of LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT be pleased to state:

(a) whether there has been unregulated growth of Business Process Outsourcing (BPO) companies;

(b) if so, whether the employees are made to work for longer hours leading to stress;

(c) if so, whether it is proposed to appoint a regulator for such companies;